

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

LARRY COFFMAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 4:07CV444 CDP
)	
ALAN BLAKE, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon the application of Larry Coffman for leave to commence this action without prepayment of the filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Upon consideration of the financial information provided with the application, the Court finds that the applicant is financially unable to pay any portion of the filing fee. As a result, plaintiff will be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Additionally, the Court has reviewed the complaint and will dismiss it pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court may dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action is frivolous if "it lacks an arguable basis in either law or in fact." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). An action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be

granted if it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief. Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957).

In reviewing a pro se complaint under § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must give the complaint the benefit of a liberal construction. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). The Court must also weigh all factual allegations in favor of the plaintiff, unless the facts alleged are clearly baseless. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992); Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974).

The Complaint

Coffman brings suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging that Missouri's Sexually Violent Predator Act, Mo. Rev. Stat. §§ 632.480 - 632.513, is unconstitutional. The complaint is duplicative of cases which have been previously dismissed as frivolous by this Court. E.g., Coffman v. Blake, 4:06CV474 CAS (E.D. Mo. 2006); Coffman v. Blake, 4:06CV1756 DDN (E.D. Mo. 2006). As a result, this case shall be dismissed as frivolous. Aziz v. Burrows, 976 F.2d 1158, 1158-59 (8th Cir. 1992) (district courts may dismiss duplicative complaints as frivolous).

Accordingly,


IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis [Doc. #2] is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue upon the complaint because the complaint is legally frivolous or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or both.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel [Doc. #4] is **DENIED** as moot.

An appropriate order of dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 17th day of April, 2007.



CATHERINE D. PERRY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE